



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

was for France an extraordinary political measure, and political measures likewise of great importance were the wars of Richelieu, which ended in the downfall of the Huguenot power. The skill of Mazarin had succeeded in inserting in the treaty of peace made at the end of the Thirty Years' War, a clause which declared every petty German prince to be a European sovereign. This practically destroyed the Empire, which henceforth could count only on the *voluntary* support of its princes. The Turks and Hungarians at one end of the Empire and the French at the other, made self-preservation a difficult matter, and hence there could be no thought of consolidation. Now all this was different in France. A civil war had been made impossible, thanks to the energetic measures of the King in expunging Protestantism. Province after province was incorporated, and the capital reaped the benefit of every extension of power. The court became the center of the system, and the idea could arise in the head of the most perfect of the French kings, merely regarded as a king, to call himself the "sun" of this system. Henceforth Paris absorbed all the best literary and artistic strength of the nation. It was the head of the nation, and this head grew at the expense of the body.

Who can fail to see in the fact of a great centralized power the true explanation of the exceptional duration of the influence of French literature which we have just noted?

It is because Louis XIV contributed so greatly to this result that his reign must ever be of especial interest, not only to the historian, but also to the student of literature.

C. A. EGGERT.

Vanderbilt University.

THE DOCTRINE OF BILINGUALISM AGAIN.

IN answering Professor Earle's rejoinder to my article on Bilingualism, I wish to point out first, that I was combatting a statement for which no single argument had ever been advanced by Professor Earle or by any one else. The doctrine of Bilingualism rested solely upon the assertion that such a fact did exist with certain examples that were said to be

accounted for by the theory. Against an assertion, unsupported by proof of any sort, even "a vague flight of reasons" might be of some importance. There is, besides, no reason to suppose that all of those I cited as having noted the use of word-pairs accept the doctrine of Professor Earle, so that I am by no means arraying myself against any such list of authorities as I quoted in my last paper. One other point of fundamental importance in such a discussion I should like to emphasize. This I may best do by quoting the words of Professor Napier of Oxford in relation to another instance of oft-asserted French influence. He says in the *Academy* of January 14, 1894:

"When any feature of language is ascribed to foreign influence, the *onus probandi* distinctly rests with those who advance or uphold their view. They must show, on the one hand, that there is need for such an assumption—that the language would not naturally, and out of its own resources, have developed the feature in question without any influence from without; and they must, on the other hand, bring positive evidence to show that the particular foreign language did exercise the influence ascribed to it."

Professor Earle says in his February letter to this Journal, that I developed two tangible points in my first paper, regarding (1) "the bilingual couplings in Chaucer" and (2) the word-pairs in the Alfredian translation. He then proceeds to say that the second fact has no relation to the other and so disposes of it. Now is not Professor's Earle's attempt to limit the discussion to what he called, "bilingual couplings in Chaucer" merely begging the question? Have we not a larger group of facts to be accounted for? It seems to me so. Taking the whole history of English together, we find an employment in every period of two, sometimes three, fairly synonymous words for the same general idea. I put the fact in the simplest possible form without suggesting in the statement the slightest reason for it. The phenomenon in question includes the use of two or more fairly synonymous words both in original works and in translations, both in poetry and prose. It does not seem best in this place to quote examples for all of these, but I shall be glad to do it if the fact is called in question. Of these word-pairs,—for as most of

the examples consist of two rather than three words I shall use this term—some proportion, not more than half for Chaucer, consists of one foreign and one native word. It is to account for this small proportion of the examples of word-pairs that Professor Earle has set up his doctrine of bilingualism. The hypothesis leaves out of account entirely all word-pairs in the larger sense, all groupings of fairly synonymous words without regard to race origin. Now may I not fairly ask, should not word-pairs rather than 'bilingual' word-pairs be considered in accounting for the phenomena? And, other things being equal, should not a theory which accounts for the larger groups of similar facts be accepted, in preference to one which accounts for a part only of the group, even if that part is bound together by a special peculiarity, in this case bilingualism?

I did no more than suggest such a theory in my first paper. But more and more it seems to me reasonable to suppose that the phenomenon in question is nothing but rhetorical amplification due to the natural desire to emphasize an idea even at the expense of repetition. This is exemplified in the older literature not only in the repetition of the idea in single words, but in clauses and sentences as well. Moreover such a theory would account for the phenomena occurring in various forms of literature as well as in various languages.

But let us examine the reasons which Professor Earle now advances for 'bilingual couplings' in Chaucer. By the time of Chaucer he says, "this novel word-coupling had acquired the force of habit which had involved the oblivion of its original condition. No amount of monolingual couplings in the fourteenth century will suffice to furnish an argument against the bilingual origin of the habit." Now I am far from denying that with two different peoples closely associated, as for instance upon the border land between two countries, there might be something like bilingual coupling in speech. My contention is, however, that this would be a conscious coupling of words from the two languages. In only one way, so far as I can see, could such a conscious coupling of words become a habit," that is an unconscious tendency of speech. Certain pairs of words

might be used so frequently that they would become established formulae, when all thought of origin would of course be forgotten. If this be true, it rests with Professor Earle to show that the 'bilingual couplings' of Chaucer are inherited formulae, and that they differ in this respect from twice or nearly twice as many monolingual couplings found in the same author. I need not say anything in addition to what I said in my first paper against the conscious coupling of French and English words by such a writer as Chaucer, for if I understand him, Professor Earle believes that Chaucer, or any writer after the fusion of the races, would use bilingual pairs only by force of a 'habit' established in the preceding centuries.

In my first paper I refrained from discussing the exact nature of the word-pairs cited either by myself or by others. I have spoken of them as fairly synonymous pairs. But Professor Earle has questioned the soundness of my groups of pairs from Chaucer, quite beyond my own admission that some might be criticised though, as I still think, without materially changing the proportions. Moreover he asserts, in order to separate more sharply the pairs I cited from the so-called Alfredian Bede, that "what we have to do with is the coupling of words which are destined to interpret each other." The implication is that the 'bilingual couplings' are all of this sort. Yet in the very examples quoted to illustrate the theory in the *Philology of the English Tongue*, did not Professor Earle somewhat stretch the point to agree with the theory? For instance take Chaucer's line (Prol. 869):

"He was a riht good wriht; a carpenter"

Now *wriht* is a less distinctive term than *carpenter* as shown by its use both in Old and in Middle English. It is to limit the more general term, rather than to give an exact equivalent, that Chaucer adds the French word, not as a French word, but as one already in use for *wriht* in one particular sense. Or take another of Professor Earle's examples, the line in describing the knight,

"Trouthe and honour, fredom and curteisye."

Is Professor Earle quite justified in saying so emphatically "*trouthe* is *honour* and *fredom* is *curteisye*?" Would it not be rather difficult

to prove that these are exactly synonymous pairs, and not partially synonymous words used as a modern writer might use them, because the two more exactly express and emphasize the thought of the poet?

Professor Earle implies that in my first article I misinterpreted his purpose in referring to 'bilingualism.' If so I regret it, although I do not now see that I have interpreted his words in any other sense than those who have borrowed and extended his doctrine. The doctrine itself, it seems to me, rests not only on a mistaken notion of language, but on that mistaken conception as to the relation of the French and English during the Norman period, which the eminent services of the historians Freeman, Stubbs and others of the school, have as yet been unable to correct.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

Cornell University.

EMILIA GALOTTI, II. 6.

IN an essay, entitled 'Zu Lessing's Emilia Galotti,' in the *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, xxvi, pp. 229 ff., Schoene points out a striking inconsistency in Lessing's famous drama.

In the sixth scene of the second act, Emilia tells her mother how the prince confessed his love to her in church. While she was praying, she said she heard somebody talking to her:

"Es sprach von Schönheit, von Liebe. . . . es beschwor mich."

When she turned she recognized the prince. She did not dare to stir for fear of attracting the attention of those about them:

"Er sprach; und ich hab' geantwortet. Aber was er sprach was ich ihm geantwortet,—fällt mir es noch bei, so ist es gut, so will ich es Ihnen sagen, meine Mutter. Itzt weiss ich von dem allen nichts. Meine Sinne hatten mich verlassen."

Now, the prince speaking to his confidant Marinelli of this meeting, in the third scene of the third act, says:

"Mit allen Schmeicheleien und Betheuerungen konnt' ich ihr auch nicht ein Wort auspressen. Stumm und niedergeschlagen und zitternd stand sie da; wie eine Verbrecherin, die ihr Todesurtheil hörte. Ihre Angst steckte mich an, ich zitterte mit, und schloss mit einer Bitte um Vergebung."

The two statements doubtless are irreconcilable, and Schoene wonders how such inconsistencies manage to escape notice in works which are read and commented upon by

thousands. The following is the nearest approach to an explanation Schoene can find (p. 233):

"Es ist unverkennbar, dass es dem plane des stückes und seiner ganzen verwickelung weit besser entspricht, wenn Emilia die liebeserklärung des prinzen mit erschrockenem und entrüstetem schweigen anhört, als wenn sie ihm durch antworten anlass und recht gibt, weiter zu ihr zu reden; denn nach Lessings plane muss Emilia absolut schuldlos und das willenlose opfer einer ruchlosen intrigue sein, der sie nur durch den tod entrückt werden kann. Dagegen ist wiederum bei der schilderung, welche Emilia von der beegnung gibt, ein psychologisch überaus wirksamer zug, dass sie ihm geantwortet hat, aber in ihrem entsetzen nicht mehr weiss weder was sie geantwortet noch was er zu ihr gesprochen hat. Dessen wird man recht inne, wenn man die den widerspruch hineintragenden worte aus dem berichte der Emilia hinwegdenkt oder das schweigen aus dem prinzlichen berichte an ihre stelle zu setzen versucht.

Und hierin wird auch die erklärung für diesen wie für viele ähnliche widersprüche liegen, die selbst bei grossen dichtern gelegentlich mit untergelaufen sind. Sie entspringen nicht sowol aus flüchtigkeit oder vergesslichkeit, als vielmehr aus dem momentanen übergewicht, das die einzelszene oder einzelschilderung in der schaffenden phantasie gewonnen hat, so dass sie sich für den augenblick aus dem gebote löst, welches die gesamtcomposition ihr auferlegt."

This explanation does not seem either satisfactory or even tenable.

Never was such a piece of dramatic algebra put on the boards as is 'Emilia Galotti.' Every line, almost every word, betrays calculation on the part of the author. This calculation is not always advantageous to the piece. To read 'Götz von Berlichingen' (which compared with 'Emilia Galotti' may be called a "genialer Klecks") immediately after Lessing's drama is almost a relief. Off and on Lessing worked many years at his 'Emilia.' He was by temperament a thinker rather than a creator in literary matters, and this natural tendency to reason out everything, and not to leave ugly flaws, was greatly heightened by his desire to prove himself equal to the high standards which he had established in his critical writings, especially in his 'Hamburgische Dramaturgie.' Hence it seems more probable that the inconsistency quoted above has a psychological reason, that